

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 152

FL 009 115

AUTHOR Ree, Joe J.
 TITLE Demonstratives and Number in Korean.
 PUB DATE 75
 NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Asian Studies on the Pacific Coast (Honolulu, Hawaii, June 19-21, 1975)
 AVAILABLE FROM Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii, Moore Hall 215, 1890 East-West Road, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96822 (\$4.50 each)
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Descriptive Linguistics; *Determiners (Languages); *Form Classes (Languages); Grammar; *Korean; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; *Morphology (Languages); Nominals; *Plurals; Pronouns
 IDENTIFIERS Anaphora; *Number (Grammar)

ABSTRACT

It is a generally held view that Korean lacks articles and that the category "number" in this language is unproductive. That is, the nouns in Korean can be used freely as definite and indefinite, and as singular and plural, without overt grammatical markers. Contrary to this view, the claim is made in this paper that non-unique nouns, i.e., nouns other than mostly kinship terms, may not be used anaphorically without the demonstrative "ku" (roughly corresponding to the English definite article "the") and, further, that if an anaphoric noun refers back to more than one member of a class, the noun must formally show the plurality.
 (Author/AM)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

Joe J. Ree

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

DEMONSTRATIVES AND NUMBER IN KOREAN

Joe J. Ree

The purpose of this paper is two-fold: First, I will briefly discuss the deictic uses of Korean demonstratives and analyze in detail one of these with regard to anaphoric reference. Second, I will attempt to show the relationship between the demonstratives and plural marking.

There are three demonstratives in Korean:

(1) i series

i + noun [+Human]	'this...'
i kes ¹	'this [non-human] thing or one'

ku series

ku + noun [+Human]	'that...near you'
ku kes	'that [non-human] thing or one near you'

ce series

ce + noun [+Human]	'that...yonder'
ce kes	'that [non-human] thing or one yonder'

Notice that the forms i, ku, and ce are used as modifiers only, and hence they must be accompanied by the noun kes, and only this, in order to be used as pronouns. The i series refers to someone or something that is closer to the speaker than the hearer; the ku series that which is closer to the hearer; and the ce series that which is away

ED148152

FL009115

from but visible to both the speaker and hearer.

For the benefit of those who are familiar with Japanese demonstratives and who, as a consequence, may incorrectly draw a parallel between the two languages, let me hasten to point out one major difference. The Japanese equivalents of i/i kes, ku/ku kes, and ce/ce kes are kono/kore, sono/sore, and ano/are, respectively. As far as making reference to someone or something visible is concerned, there is little or no difference between the two languages in the behavior of these demonstratives. However, the difference lies in the fact that in Korean the ku series is the only one which may be used to refer to something or someone invisible or previously mentioned; whereas in Japanese both the so and a series equally figure, the selection depending on the referent involved.

The deictic usage of the demonstratives in Korean presents no problem; in fact, satisfactory descriptions of them can be found in most textbooks. What is totally lacking in almost all Korean grammars written to date,² however, is an analysis of the anaphoric demonstrative ku, to which I now turn.

It is a generally held view that Korean lacks articles and that nouns can be used freely as both definite and indefinite without overt grammatical markers. This view seems to be factually supported by sentences such as the following.

- (2) Mary palo yeph-ey anceiss-nun Ø haksayng
'the student sitting right next to Mary'
- (3) i pan Ø haksayng sampunciil-un sihem-ey hapkyekhayssta
'One third of the students in this class passed the examination.'
- (4) ssekkicen-ey Ø wuyu-lul nayngcangko-ey cipenehla
'Put the milk in the refrigerator before it spoils.'
- (5) Swunca-nun i pen hakki-ey umsenghak-ul thaykhako
issnuntey yenge ttaymun-ey Ø sensayng selmyeng-ul
cal mos ala tutnunta
'Sunja is taking a phonetics course this term, and she has difficulty in understanding the teacher's explanation because of her English.'

We note that none of the Korean sentences contains any form equivalent to the definite article in English. This fact seems further supported by sentences like:

- (6) Speaker A: nay naphwukin eti kasseyo?
'What happened to my napkin?'
- Speaker B: Øcepsi mith-ey isseyo
'(It's) under the plate.'

We find that in the case of referring to a visible object, too, no overt article-like form is used in Korean. The use of the demonstrative ku, the only possibility in this case, would not be ungrammatical but would be unusual.

There are, however, cases involving anaphoric reference in which the ku form figures obligatorily, functioning quite like the definite article in English. Consider these sentences:

- (7) a. nan elyessulttay mayil achim sikol-ey iss-nun
cel-ey kitohale kassta

'When I was a boy, I went to a temple in the
country to pray every morning.'

- b. ku cel-un wuli cip-eyse kkway melessta.

'The temple was quite far from our house.'

- c. * $\emptyset$ cel-un wuli cip-eyse kkway melessta

- (8) a. nan ecey cwungkwuk chinkwu-hako siktang-eyse
hankwuk umsik-ul mekessta.

'Yesterday I had Korean food with a Chinese
friend of mine at a restaurant.'

- b. ku (hankwuk) umsik-un acwu cca-ko maywessta

'It (the food) was very spicy.'

- c. * $\emptyset$ (hankwuk) umsik-un acwu cca-ko maywessta

- b'. ku (cwungkwuk) chinkwu-nun Hawai Tayhak-eyse
enehak-ul kaluchinta

'He (the friend) teaches linguistics at the
University of Hawaii.'

- c'. * $\emptyset$ (cwungkwuk) chinkwu-nun Hawai Tayhak-eyse
enehak-ul kaluchinta

- (9) a. eceypam-ey mikwuk salam-i han salam cip-ey chaca
wassta

'An American came to see us last night.'

- b. ku mikwuk salam-un hankwuk mal-ul yuchang hakey
hayssta

'He (the American) spoke Korean fluently.'

- c. * $\emptyset$ mikwuk salam-un hankwuk mal-ul yuchang hakey
hayssta

Interestingly enough, these anaphoric cases require the
presence of the ku, without which the b sentences would
be unacceptable, as the c sentences testify. Notice that

the obligatory occurrence of the demonstrative does not seem to depend on the syntactic function of the referent.

One may wonder whether the presence of a modifier other than the demonstrative ku, an adjective, for example, will make the c sentences more acceptable. As the following sentences demonstrate, the occurrence of an adjective alone without the ku still leaves the unacceptability intact.

- (10) a. nan elyessulttay mayil achim sikol-ey iss-nun
yumyenghan cel-ey kitohale kassta

'When I was a boy, I went to a famous temple in the country to pray every morning.'

- b. ku [yumyenghan] cel-un wuli cip-eyse kkway melessta

'The [famous] temple was quite far from our house.'

- c. *Ø yumyenghan cel-un wuli cip-eyse kkway melessta

Further support may be received from the following.

Assume that a male surgeon is confronted by a female patient literally dying of lung cancer. Despite the doctor's tactful explanation that no surgery of any kind will do any good in her case, she insists on her demand that surgery be performed outright. Upon realizing his unyielding position, however, she really gives it to him. After her departure, the doctor and nurse engage in the following dialog:³

- (11) Doctor: akka ku hwanca (or yeca or salam) natele
mwelako hayssci?

'Did you hear what she (the patient) said to me?'

Nurse: cengmal ku hwanca-nun pothong-i ani tenteyyo
ku mal-ul tulesulttay cen kkamccak nollasseyo

'Boy, she was really something, wasn't she?
I nearly fainted when I heard the word.'

Note that hwanca 'patient' and mal 'word' again require the demonstrative ku, without which the nouns cannot refer to their first occurrence.

That the role of the demonstrative ku is crucial in anaphoric reference may perhaps be further shown by the following unorthodox but telling example, which is sometimes heard among men.

(12) ani Changswulan nom-un ku key nemu caka-se cangka-lul mos kantey

'You know something? They say Changsu cannot get married because his...is too small.'

There is no doubt in the hearer's mind what the word ku is referring to.

There is one case which seems to be an apparent counterexample to the ones requiring the demonstrative ku. Let us examine these sentences:

(13) a. nan ecey {apeci
Chelswu} hako naksicil hale kassta

'I went fishing with {my father
Chelsu} yesterday.'

b. ∅ {apeci
Chelswu} -nun kwukminhakkyo kyocang i ta

{My father
Chelsu} is an elementary school principal.'

c. *ku {apeci
Chelswu} -nun kwukminhakkyo kyocang i ta

We note that unlike the sentences discussed earlier the kinds of nouns appearing in these sentences are different in that their identification is unique. Consequently, the

use of ku in cases like this falsely implies that there are more persons of the same identification. We may liken these to such nouns as moon, sun, phone, etc. in English, which are always marked by the definite article because of their obvious identification, except when they are modified by an adjective.

Let us now consider the following sentences.

- (14) a. nan sohakkyo ttay kyewul-eyn kyohoy-ey nakako
yelum-eyn cel-ey nakassta

'When I was in elementary school, I went to church in winter and to temple in summer.'

- b. Ø kyohoy-nun wuli cip kakkai issessta
[kulena cel-un san wi-ey issessta]

'The church was near our house.'
['And the temple was on top of the mountain.']

- c. *ku kyohoy-nun wuli cip kakkai issessta

- (15) a. nan onul paykhwacem-eyse yenge sacen hako hanmun
sacen-ul sassta

'Today I bought an English dictionary and a Chinese-character dictionary at a department store.'

- b. Ø yenge sacen-un kapsi kwaynchanhayssta
[kulena hanmun sacen-un emchengnakey pissassta]

'The English dictionary was reasonable.'
['But the Chinese-character dictionary was unbelievably expensive.']

- c. *ku yenge sacen-un kapsi kwaynchanhayssta

We find that in these sentences, where the repeated nouns are used just as referentially as the ones discussed immediately above, the ku form is not allowed. Actually, the sentence with ku in each case, if considered apart from

the intended meaning, is well-formed. That is, the sentence in (14c), for example, would otherwise mean that there had been other churches which the speaker had attended and that the particular one he attended in his elementary school years was near his house. But then this sentence and the one in (14b) are no longer synonymous. Similarly, to cite a parallel example from English, sentence b and sentence c in the following do not mean the same.

- (16) a. I visited a zoo and a museum yesterday.
 b. The zoo was clean [but the museum was not].
 c. That zoo was clean.

How do we, then, account for these two disparate facts? A close examination of sentences (14) and (15), and others like them, reveals that they all involve a contrast of some sort. That is, in each case the two items, one member each from two different classes, are simply contrasted with regard to some attribute, rather than a certain member of one and the same class being singled out, as the other cases already discussed. Consequently, the occurrence of ku with any of these nouns standing in comparison to each other will destroy their semantic relationship.

To summarize the constraints we have discussed so far: A non-unique noun may not be repeated without the anaphoric demonstrative ku unless the noun stands in comparison with one or more other nouns.

I now turn to another usage of the ku which may or may

not be subsumed under the process of anaphoric reference.

Consider the following:

- (17) enehak capci-ey nul na-nun ku Chomsky-ey ilum
'the name Chomsky that constantly appears in
linguistic journals'
- (18) hankwuk mal-to ku paywu-nun salam yelseng kwa
caynung-ey ttalase cinpo-ka talupnita
'In learning Korean, too, the rate of progress
depends on the learner's enthusiasm and ability.'
- (19) swuswul-ilan ku kyelkwa-lul enu cengto yeychukhalswu
issey a hanunkeciyo
'Look, you don't perform surgery unless you have
some idea about its result, right?'

The ku in sentences of this kind is not only optional but also seems non-anaphoric. That is to say, its function seems to be one of emphasizing or reinforcing the accompanying noun. Let us compare these with the following:

- (20) a. nay anay-ka i isang nahako mos salkeyssta-nuntey
Ø iyu-lul molukeysseyo
'My wife says she can no longer live with me; I
don't know why.'
- b. nay anay-ka i isang nahako mos salkeyssta-nuntey
ku iyu-lul molukeysseyo
'My wife says she can no longer live with me, but
I just can't figure out what the reason is; I
am concerned.'
- (21) a. apenim-kkeyse swuswul-ul hasyessta-nun mal-ul tuless-
nuntey Ø kyelkwa-ka ettehkey toysseyo?
'I heard that your father underwent surgery; how did
it go?'
- b. apenim-kkeyse swuswul-ul hasyessta-nun mal-ul tuless-
nuntey ku kyelkwa-ka ettehkey toysseyo?
'I heard that your father underwent surgery; I'm very
anxious to find out about the result.'

The difference in nuance of the two sentences in each set, admittedly, may be subtle, but it is there. The a version implies that the speaker is somewhat casual about the matter, whereas the b version connotes that the speaker is truly concerned.

Similarly, in the following

(22) a. nayil sophung mos kal salam-un $\emptyset$ iyu-lul malhaypwa

'Those of you who cannot make it to the picnic tomorrow tell me why.'

b. nayil sophung mos kal salam-un ku iyu-lul halhaypwa

'Those of you who cannot make it to the picnic tomorrow had better have a good reason for me.'

the first sentence suggests that the teacher is merely interested in finding out the reason, whereas those unable to make it ought to have a convincing reason ready for the second one.

Although it is not clear at the moment, it seems that these uses are special cases of the more general process of anaphoric reference in Korean. For lack of something better, I suggest the term 'emotive' to characterize these special uses of the demonstrative ku.

Before turning to the question of the relationship between the demonstratives, the anaphoric ku in particular, and plural marking, let me in a general way discuss some characteristics of plurality in Korean. The Korean form roughly equivalent, at least in meaning, to the English plural morpheme -s is -tul, as shown in:

(23) a. hankwuk salam-tul 'Koreans

b. namu-tul 'trees'

What is radically different from English, and sometimes frustrating to learners of Korean, is that nouns are often not marked for number. That is, the underlined nouns in the following sentences, for example, may be either singular or plural in number.

(24) nan onul yenphil-ul sassta

a. I bought a pencil today.

b. I bought some pencils today.

(25) Yengswu chinkwu-nun pucata

a. Yengsu's friend is rich.

b. Yengsu's friends are rich.

(26) hankwuk salam-i ceki seissta

a. A Korean is standing over there.

b. Some Koreans are standing over there.

It seems that what is foremost in the mind of the speaker, and indeed, in the minds of Koreans, is the person or thing involved rather than the number. In other words, it may be that Korean speakers simply identify the class in question by naming one member, because, after all, what has to be central at the very first utterance is the class to which a given object belongs. At any rate, because of this "lax" state of affairs in the category of number, most grammar books do no more than simply introduce the form -tul for the meaning 'more than one' with the usual statement that the category number is not very productive in Korean.

Indeed, in many cases the irregular behavior of -tul seems to show no pattern. A careful study of a large number of sentences in which it does show up reveals, however, that plural marking in Korean does follow certain principles. I will informally discuss one such principle which is directly relevant to this paper. Observe the following:

(27) i salam

a. 'this person'

b. *'these persons'

but i salam-tul 'these persons'

(28) ku salam

a. 'that (or the) person'

b. *'those (or the) persons'

but ku salam-tul 'those (or the) persons'

(29) ce salam

a. 'that person yonder'

b. *'those persons yonder'

but ce salam-tul 'those persons yonder'

(30) i namu

a. 'this tree'

b. *'these trees'

but i namu-tul 'these trees'

(31) ku namu

a. 'that (or the) tree'

b. *'those (or the) trees'

but ku namu tul 'those (or the) trees'

(32) ce namu

a. 'that tree yonder'

b. *'those trees yonder'

but ce namu-tul 'those trees yonder'

We note that when a noun is modified by a demonstrative, it is unambiguously singular, as the unacceptability of the b phrase in each set shows. In order for a noun modified by a demonstrative to be plural in number, the marker -tul must be added, as the phrases containing it demonstrate.

There are some cases, such as the examples given below, in which one can use the phrase demonstrative + noun without -tul in pointing at more than one object (see also Song 1975).

(33) i talkyal-un ce talkyal pota te khuta

'This (set of) egg(s) is larger than that (set of) egg(s) over there.'

There are two things to be noted here, however. First, in this case the noun phrase containing a demonstrative but not the plural marker -tul refers to a class of objects, rather than a randomly selected member. Second, this use of demonstrative + noun seems limited to a certain class of nouns; that is, those nouns which represent not only inanimate but also "small" objects. Thus the noun phrases in sentences like the following do not seem to refer to a class of objects.

(34) i haksayng-un ce haksayng pota kongpu-lul te cal hanta

'This student is (a) better (student) than that one over there.'

In order to have the meaning of 'class' or 'group' a word such as pan 'class(room)' would have to be added, as in:

- (35) i pan haksayng-un ce pan haksayng pota kongpu-lul
te cal hanta

'(The students of) this class (are)/is better than
(the students of) that class over there.'

Similarly, the subject noun phrase which involves a large object in (36) does not seem to refer to a class.

- (36) i catongcha-nun ce catongcha pota te pissata

'This car is more expensive than that one over there.'

The point being made is that sentences like (33) do not seem to falsify the assumption that a noun modified by a demonstrative refers to a single object.

In order to see how all this is relevant to the question of obligatory plural marking, let us examine the following:

- (37) nan ecey pam-ey seykyey-lul ilcwu hakosiph-un sayngkak
seykyey-eyse ceyil puca-ka toyepoko-siph-un sayngkak
mikwuk taythongyeng-i toyepoko-siph-un sayngkak
ilen celen sayngkak-ey camkyessta

'Last night I was obsessed by such thoughts as, "I want to travel around the world," "I want to be the richest person in the world," "I want to be a president of the United States."

Now if the constraints that I have suggested above are correct, the Korean equivalent of the sentence

- (38) These (same) thoughts occupied or plagued my mind
again this morning

will have to be

- (39) a. ku sayngkak-tul-i onul achim-ey tto melisok-ey
tteollassta

- b. * $\emptyset$ sayngkak-tul-i onul achim-ey tto melisok-ey
tteollassta
- c. *ku sayngkak- $\emptyset$ -i onul achim-ey tto melisok-ey
tteollassta

Note that the repeated noun sayngkak in b cannot be co-referential with that in (37) without the anaphoric demonstrative ku. Similarly, the phrase ku sayngkak in c, which is not marked by the form -tul, can only refer to one specific thought. Consequently, only the sentence in (39a), which meets both of these conditions, is acceptable.

It is clear then that plural marking in this is not only obligatory but predictable, which may be summarized as: If an anaphoric noun refers back to more than one member of a class, the noun must formally show the plurality. It will be observed that this principle is consonant with facts.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Yale romanization system is used in this paper.
2. Professor Samuel Martin's unpublished Korean reference grammar may very well touch on this question, but, unfortunately, I have not had access to it.
3. This example and many others are based on some of the selections in Tayhak kwukmun sen [Selected readings for college students].

REFERENCES

Song, Seok Chong. 1975. "Rare Plural Marking and Ubiquitous Plural Marker in Korean." A paper delivered before the 11th Chicago Linguistic Society.

Subcommittee on the Korean Language (ed.). 1972. Tayhak kwukmun sen [Selected readings for college student]. Seoul: ulyu Munhawa sa.